UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/826,219	04/04/2001	Roni Korenshtein	004411.P003	2469

7590 03/25/2004

EXAMINER
ZHOU, TING

Michael A. DeSanctis
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	8

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/826,219	KORENSHTEIN, RONI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ting Zhou	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 February 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 26 February 2004 have been received and entered. Claims 1-20 as amended are pending in the application.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1, 10, 11 and 20 are objected to because of the following informalities: the use of "environment/context" on lines 14, 13, 8 and 13 of the respective claims is misleading. It is unclear whether the intended use is "environment and context" or "environment or context". Furthermore, reference to the "environment" in "retrieval from a current environment" as recited in the claims is not disclosed in the Specification. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-11, 13, 15-16, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by O'Connell U.S. Patent 5,991,882.

Referring to claim 1, O'Connell teaches a method comprising providing prerequisite information regarding pages of a graphical user interface (column 2, lines 54-56) that are prerequisites to other pages of the GUI, each page including one or more sub-components (pages displaying prerequisite questions that must be answered are prerequisites to other pages of questions that must be answered until a predetermined number of correct questions have been answered) (column 5, lines 65-67 and column 6, lines 2-19 and 49-67); in response to a request to display a destination page (page displaying the resetting of the user's password) and with reference to the prerequisite information, identifying one or more prerequisite pages (pages displaying questions that must be correctly answered) associated with a request to display a destination page; determining which of the one or more sub-components is a decider sub-component capable of confirming whether or not requirements of the identified prerequisite page has been satisfied (confirming whether all of questions have been answered correctly) (column 6, lines 49-67); determining whether or not requirements of the identified prerequisite page have been satisfied by invoking a method of an instance of the decider sub-component that causes the stored information regarding the state of the identified prerequisite page to be retrieved from a current environment/context (comparing the currently input answer to the question displayed on the screen against the answers in the stored file) (column 3, lines 29-32 and 45-50); and causing the output of the destination page to be displayed if the requirements have been satisfied (resetting of the user's password if all of the predetermined number of questions have been answered correctly), otherwise causing the prerequisite page having the unsatisfied requirements

to be displayed (displaying each question that have not been answered until all the predetermined questions have been correctly answered) (column 6, lines 56-62). This is further shown in Figures 4 and 5, where steps of displaying prerequisite questions and verifying the answers can be seen.

Referring to claim 10, O'Connell teaches a system comprising a properties data store including information regarding pages of the GUI that are prerequisites to other pages of the GUI (pages displaying prerequisite questions that must be answered are prerequisites to other pages of questions that must be answered until a predetermined number of correct questions have been answered) (column 5, lines 65-67 and column 6, lines 2-19 and 49-67), a base agent to respond to requests to display a destination page of the GUI, in response to a request to display the destination page (displaying the resetting of the user's password), the base agent causing the output of the destination page to be displayed if all the requirements of one or more prerequisite pages associated with the destination page have been satisfied (resetting of the user's password if the predetermined number of questions have been answered correctly), otherwise causing the output of a prerequisite page of the one or more prerequisite pages to be displayed (displaying each question that have not been answered until all the predetermined questions have been correctly answered) (column 6, lines 56-62), and a prerequisite factory decoupling the pages from their respective prerequisite pages, the prerequisite factory to determine whether or not requirements of one or more identified prerequisite pages have been satisfied by causing information regarding the state of the one or more identified prerequisite pages to be retrieved from a current environment/context (comparing the currently input answer to the question

displayed on the screen against the answers in the stored file) (column 3, lines 29-32 and 45-50). This is further shown in Figures 4 and 5.

Referring to claims 3 and 13, O'Connell teaches supporting hierarchical relationships of prerequisite pages by iterating through each of the identified prerequisite pages associated with the destination page in a predetermined order until encountering the first prerequisite page that has one or more requirements that have not been satisfied and displaying the first prerequisite page of the identified prerequisite pages before displaying a second prerequisite page of the identified prerequisite pages that has one or more requirements that have not been satisfied, the second prerequisite page being dependent upon the first prerequisite page according to the predetermined order, as recited in column 6, lines 49-67 and column 7, lines 1-3 and further shown in Figure 5.

Referring to claims 5 and 15, O'Connell teaches a prerequisite property for each of the pages of the GUI, the prerequisite property comprising a string identifying the one or more prerequisite pages (identifying the question, or prerequisite property that must be answered correctly) (column 6, lines 49-55).

Referring to claims 6 and 16, O'Connell teaches the prerequisite information being structured as a list of attribute-value pairs (each question-answer pair, as shown in Figure 3), and wherein a first and second page are identified as prerequisites for a third page (for example, the third question is displayed to the user after the first and second questions have been answered correctly) (column6, lines 56-63 and further shown in Figure 5).

Referring to claim 8, O'Connell teaches a page prerequisite object verifying whether all the requirements have been satisfied (the router determining whether the total number of

questions answered correctly have been satisfied) (column 6, lines 63-67 and column 7, lines 1-3).

Referring to claims 9 and 18, O'Connell teaches page objects corresponding to the pages of the GUI and page prerequisite objects responsible for ensuring satisfaction of one or more prerequisite conditions are loosely coupled and may be dynamically associated with each other by way of the prerequisite information (column 6, lines 9-20).

Referring to claim 11, O'Connell teaches the prerequisite factory identifying the one or more prerequisite pages associated with the destination page by accessing the properties data store (identifying the questions that must be answered correctly in order to reset the user's password), determining which of one or more sub-components of an identified prerequisite page is a decider sub-component that is capable of confirming whether or not requirements of the identified prerequisite page have been satisfied (confirming whether all of questions have been answered correctly) (column 6, lines 49-67), creating an instance of the decider sub-component, and determining whether or not the requirements of the identified prerequisite page have been satisfied by invoking a method of the instance that causes information regarding the state of the identified prerequisite page to be retrieved from the current environment/context (comparing the currently input answer to the question displayed on the screen against the answers in the stored file) (column 3, lines 29-32 and 45-50).

Referring to claim 20, O'Connell teaches a machine-readable medium causing the processor to identify one or more prerequisite pages associated with a destination page by accessing a properties file in response to a request for the destination page, the properties file including prerequisite information regarding pages of a GUI that are prerequisite to other pages

of the GUI (pages displaying prerequisite questions that must be answered are prerequisites to other pages of questions that must be answered until a predetermined number of correct questions have been answered) (column 5, lines 65-67 and column 6, lines 2-19 and 49-67), determining which sub-component of an identified prerequisite page is capable of confirming whether or not requirements of the identified prerequisite page have been satisfied (confirming whether all of questions have been answered correctly) (column 6, lines 49-67), determining whether the requirements of the identified prerequisite page have been satisfied by invoking a method of an instance of the sub-component that causes stored information regarding the state of the identified prerequisite page to be retrieved from a current environment/context (comparing the currently input answer to the question displayed on the screen against the answers in the stored file) (column 3, lines 29-32 and 45-50), and causing the output of the destination page to be displayed if all the requirements of the one or more identified prerequisite pages have been satisfied (resetting of the user's password if all of the predetermined number of questions have been answered correctly), otherwise causing the output of a prerequisite page of the one or more identified prerequisite pages having one or more requirements that have not been satisfied to be displayed (displaying each question that have not been answered until all the predetermined questions have been correctly answered) (column 6, lines 56-62). This is further shown in Figures 4 and 5, where steps of displaying prerequisite questions and verifying the answers can be seen.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Connell U.S. Patent 5,991,882, as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Zerber U.S. Patent 6,175,877.

Referring to claims 2 and 12, O'Connell teaches all of the limitations as applied to the claims above. Specifically, O'Connell teaches storing prerequisite information (password reset information) in the form of files residing in a data storage system, as recited in column 3, lines 1-6 and 29-32. However, O'Connell fails to explicitly teach storing the prerequisite information in a Java properties file. Zerber teaches a system comprising prerequisite information such as user login information (column 4, lines 57-67) similar to the prerequisite information of O'Connell. In addition, Zerber further teaches the use of Java files to implement functions of the system (column 3, lines 30-36); therefore, system information such as the user login prerequisite information can be implemented via Java files. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of O'Connell and Zerber before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the prerequisite information system of O'Connell to include the use of java files taught by Zerber. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to

give users versatility in being able to implement the interface with various different software languages.

5. Claims 4, 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Connell U.S. Patent 5,991,882, as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Brown et al. U.S. Patent 6,073,119.

Referring to claims 4 and 14, while O'Connell teaches all of the limitations as applied to the claims above, she fails to teach the request to display the destination page comprising of a HTTP request and wherein the pages of the GUI comprise web pages. Brown et al. teach a method prompting the user to enter prerequisite information such as a user ID and password for identification verification (column 18, lines 35-46) similar to that of O'Connell. In addition, Brown et al. further teach requests to display the destination page comprises a HTTP request, and wherein the pages of the of the GUI comprise web pages (column 2, lines 61-64 and column 3, lines 59-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of O'Connell and Brown et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the method taught by O'Connell to include the online implementation via web pages taught by Brown et al.. It would have been advantageous for one to utilize such a combination because the Internet is growing at such a fast rate and this would allow users to conduct activities involving sensitive information such as banking and other financial transactions via the Internet without having to worry about security issues.

Referring to claim 19, while Miller et al. teach a method for identifying, at run-time, one or more prerequisite pages associated with a properties file and determining whether

requirements have been satisfied (identifying one or more questions that are associated with a user and determining whether the predetermined number of questions have been answered correctly) (column 6, lines 49-67 and further shown in Figure 5) and causing the output of the requested page to be displayed if all the requirements have been satisfied (resetting of the user's password if all of the predetermined number of questions have been answered correctly), otherwise causing the output of a prerequisite page of the one or more identified prerequisite pages having one or more unsatisfied requirements to be displayed (displaying each question that have not been answered until all the predetermined questions have been correctly answered) (column 6, lines 56-62). However, O'Connell fails to teach the method being applied to web pages. Brown et al. teach a method prompting the user to enter prerequisite information such as a user ID and password for identification verification (column 18, lines 35-46) similar to that of O'Connell. In addition, Brown et al. further teach the implementation of the method over the Internet via web pages (column 2, lines 61-64 and column 3, lines 59-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of O'Connell and Brown et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the method taught by O'Connell to include the online implementation via web pages taught by Brown et al.. It would have been advantageous for one to utilize such a combination because the Internet is growing at such a fast rate and this would allow users to conduct activities involving sensitive information such as banking and other financial transactions via the Internet without having to worry about security issues.

6. Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Connell U.S. Patent 5,991,882, as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Miller et al. U.S. Patent 5,550,968.

Referring to claims 7 and 17, while O'Connell teaches all of the limitations as applied to the claims above, O'Connell fails to explicitly teach modifying the prerequisite information without necessitating recompilation of software code. Miller et al. teach a system comprising prerequisite information such as user password access information (column 2, lines 53-59 and further shown in Figure 6). In addition, Miller et al. further teach modifying the prerequisite information without recompilation of software code. The prerequisite information (determining step) can readily be changed from password entry to checking user identification for authorized level, to checking the level of access permitted by workstations, as recited in column 3, lines 50-56. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of O'Connell and Miller et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the prerequisite information system of O'Connell to include the modification of the prerequisite information taught by Miller et al. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to allow users to periodically update and change the information used for controlling access to sensitive information, for added security purposes.

7. The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach similar methods for displaying pages of a GUI after the satisfaction of some prerequisite information.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (703)305-0328. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

March 17, 2004

JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100